

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-39 were rejected. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 14, 15, 17-21, 25, 27-29, 32, 33, 35, 36 and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to this rejection, a prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218, U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In this particular case, each and every feature of the presently claimed invention is not identically shown or described in AAPA, arranged as they are in the claims.

For example, claim 1 recites the following:

1. A method for generating an event monitoring display, comprising:
receiving an event message, wherein the event message has associated therewith an identifier;
inserting the event message into a field based on the identifier;
presenting the field; and
automatically scrolling the field so that the event message is visible.

With regard to claim 1, the Office Action states the following:

As per claim 1, the AAPA teaches a method for generating an event monitoring display, comprising: receiving an event message and inserting the event message into a field based on the identifier; presenting the field and automatically scrolling the field so that the event message is visible (page 1, lines 11-21). The AAPA does not explicitly state that the event message has associated with it an identifier, however, in order to access any event or message, it is inherent that there must be an associated identifier.


Office Action dated 3/15/2004, page 2.

Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, the AAPA recites the following:

Typically, the messages are displayed in ascending or descending chronological order in a scrolling text field. For example, when displayed in ascending order, *a new message may be concatenated at the bottom of the text field* and the text field may or may not be automatically scrolled to the bottom to display the new message (*emphasis added*). (subject application, Page 1, Lines 15-21).

Thus, the AAPA explicitly describes a new message as being "concatenated" at the bottom of the text field - not inserted into the text field "based on the identifier" as asserted in the Office Action. The AAPA provides no description or suggestion for inserting the new message into the text field based on an associated identifier of the new message.

As described in the present application, a message is inserted into a text field "based on the identifier" as claimed. For example, Figure 8 shows the following:



As can be seen, the message may be inserted into the text field below the message with the next larger subID if a message having a matching ID is not found and there is a message with a larger subID within the text field. Alternatively, the new message may be inserted into the text field below a message with a smaller subID if one exists in the text field and no message with a matching ID is found (step 806). If a message having a matching ID or subID is found in the text field, the new message may be inserted below the last message with the same ID (step 816). The processing steps of Figure 8 may be modified to place the messages in descending order based on ID and subIDs of the messages or in other orders based on message IDs and/or subIDs as described in the subject application.

Independent claims 9, 19, 27, and 37-38 recite similar features as claim 1. Therefore, the same distinctions between AAPA and the claimed invention in claim 1 apply for these claims. For the reasons described above, the AAPA does not contain all elements of independent claims 1, 9, 19, 27, and 37-38. Hence, the AAPA fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in claims 1, 9, 19, 27, and 37-38. Since claims 2-3 and 7 depend from claim 1, claims 10-11, 14 and 15 depend from claim 9, claims 20-21 and 25 depend from claim 19, and claims 28-29, 32 and 33 depend from claim 27, the same distinctions between AAPA and the claimed invention in independent claims 1, 9, 19, and 27 apply for these claims. Additionally, claims 2-3, 7, 10-11, 14, 15, 20-21, 25, 28-29, and 32-33, and claim other additional combinations of features not suggested by the AAPA. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 14, 15, 19-21, 25, 27-29, 32, 33, and 37-38 have been overcome.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 14, 15, 19-21, 25, 27-29, 32, 33, and 37-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome, and such a notice is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 17, the Office Action states the following:

As per claims 17, the AAPA teaches the method for presenting messages in a field containing a plurality of messages, comprising: receiving a plurality of messages (*system configured to receive text messages*), categorizing the messages, sorting the messages by

chronology, and then presenting the messages in a field (*messages are displayed/presented in chronological order*) (page 1, lines 11-25). The AAPA does not explicitly state that the event message has associated with it an identifier, however, in order to access any event or message and sort in chronological order, it is inherent that there must be an associated identifier.

Office Action dated 3/15/2004, page 4.


Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 17 recites the following:

17. A method for presenting messages in a field containing a plurality of messages, comprising:
 receiving a plurality of messages, wherein each message has associated therewith an identifier;
 categorizing the messages by identifier;
 sorting the messages by chronology, whereby messages with the same identifier appear in chronological order; and
 presenting the messages in a field.

As recited in the subject application:

...text messages 410 may be categorized into multiple instances of sequenced text messages 420. For example, text messages may be categorized into separate text fields by ID and sequenced within each text field by sub ID. Furthermore, the separate instances of sequenced text messages may be distributed to and displayed by other monitoring computers. (Application, Page 12, Lines 13-18).

For example, Figure 7 shows the following:



As can be seen, messages are categorized by identifier (e.g., ID of Level 2 in text field 730; ID of Level 3 in text field 740) and messages with the same identifier are displayed in chronological order. The AAPA, on the other hand, only describes messages as being concatenated, that is inserted at the beginning or end of a text field, such that the messages are displayed in ascending or descending chronological order. In such an implementation, chronological display of only messages sharing a common identifier (as shown in text field 730 and 740) among received messages of multiple identifiers (as shown in text field 710) is not possible. The AAPA neither describes, suggests or otherwise alludes to "categorizing the messages by identifier" such that messages "with the same identifier appear in chronological order."

Thus, the AAPA does not contain all elements of independent claim 17. Hence, the AAPA fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in claim 17. Additionally, independent claims 35 and 39 recite similar features as claim 17. Therefore, the same distinctions between AAPA and the claimed invention in claim 17 applies for these claims. Since claim 18 depends from claim 17 and claim 36 depends from claim 35, the same distinctions between the AAPA and the claimed invention in independent claims 17 and 35 apply for these claims. Additionally, claims 18 and 36 claim other additional combinations of features not suggested by the AAPA. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 17-18, 35-36, and claim 39 have been overcome, and such a notice is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, the AAPA does not teach, suggest, or give any incentive to make the needed changes to reach the presently claimed invention. The AAPA actually teaches away from the presently claimed invention because it teaches a technique for displaying messages when chronology of messages is most important as opposed to a display of messages in a manner where message associations or messages otherwise related may be easily located as in the presently claimed invention (See subject application, Page 1, Lines 15-24; and Page 2, Line 2-6). Absent the examiner pointing out some teaching or incentive to implement the AAPA and a technique for sequencing or categorizing messages based on associated message IDs, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be

led to modify the AAPA to reach the present invention when the AAPA is examined as a whole. Absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive to modify the AAPA in this manner, the presently claimed invention can be reached only through an improper use of hindsight using the applicants' disclosure as a template to make the necessary changes to reach the claimed invention.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The examiner has rejected claims 4-6, 12, 13, 18, 22-24 and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 4-5, the Office Action states:

As per claims 4 and 5, in addition to what is taught in claim 1, the AAPA does not specifically teach the method wherein the step of inserting the event message into the field comprises inserting the event message before a previous message with the same identifier, whereby messages with the same identifier appear in chronological or reverse chronological order. However, Official Notice is taken that chronological ordering of messages (based on a time or date stamp) is very well known in the art therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend the teachings of the AAPA to include the chronological ordering of messages for the subset of messages with the same identifiers in order to improve the organization of the message list.

Office Action dated 15 March 2004, pages 6-7.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, the AAPA describes only a technique for concatenating, i.e., inserting an event message at a beginning or end of the field, and provides no description or suggestion for inserting the event message "into a field based on an identifier." Inasmuch as base claim 1 includes elements not shown or described in claims 4 and 5, the same distinctions between the AAPA and the claimed invention in claim 1 apply for these claims. Moreover, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, claims 4 and 5 are non-obvious as Applicants have already demonstrated claim 1 to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 5 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence on an allowable base claim.

With respect to claim 6, the Office Action states the following:

Official Notice is taken that it is well known in the art to attach a two-part identifier to a message therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create an identifier comprising of both an identification and a sub-identification to classify event messages in a very specific manner.

Office Action dated 15 March 2004, page 7.

As noted above, the AAPA does not provide any description or suggestion for "inserting the event message into a field based on the identifier," and thus claim 6 is non-obvious at least by virtue of dependence on an allowable base claim.

Additionally, each of claims 12, 13, 22-24, and 30-31 were rejected on the same basis as one or more of claims 4-6. The same distinctions apply between these claims and the base claims from which they are dependent, and thus claims 12, 13, 22-24, and 30-31 are non-obvious at least by virtue of their dependence on allowable base claim.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 4-6, 12, 13, 18, 22-24, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

Additionally, claims 8, 16, 26, and 34 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over the AAPA in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,751,791 to Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 8, the Office Action states:

As per claim 8, the AAPA does not teach the method wherein the event message includes at least one of sound data, image data, and video data. However, Chen teaches the method wherein the event message includes at least one of sound data, image data, and video data (Col. 1, lines 54-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the AAPA to send event messages with text to also include Chen's method of handling event messages with video data in order to add a multimedia dimension to the event messages.

Office Action, page 8 dated 15 March 2004, page 8.

Chen generally describes a network based multimedia messaging system for enabling a caller to leave a recipient a message using a multimedia device. Chen neither describes or suggests techniques that facilitate event monitoring. Particularly, Chen neither describes or suggests a technique for inserting an event message into a field "based on the identifier" associated with the event message. Thus, Chen provides for none of the deficiencies of the AAPA and is insufficient, alone or in combination with the

AAPA, to obviate the subject invention as claimed. As claim 8 depends from a base claim demonstrated above to be non-obvious, claim 8 is allowable at least by virtue of dependence from a non-obvious base claim.

With respect to claims 16, 26, and 34, each were rejected on the same basis as claim 8, and each contain elements by dependence on an allowable base claim that is distinguishable over the AAPA and Chen. Thus, claims 16, 26, and 34 are non-obvious.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 8, 16, 26, and 34 are patentable over the AAPA in view of Chen, and such a notice is respectfully requested.


III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the AAPA and Chen and is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 15 June 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Steven T. McDonald
Reg. No. 45,999
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Agent for Applicants